

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-10, and 20-21 are pending. Claims 11-18 were previously cancelled with the prior response. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-5, 8, 9, AND 20 UNDER § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 8, 9, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0062267 (Minami et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0014936 (Jinzaki). Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reason.

- i. Neither Minami nor Jinzaki teach or suggest a transmit output data flow controller configured to control the flow of encrypted data from a first and a second processor to a memory system in the same location as the order in which the data was read from the memory system, as recited in claim 1.*

Claim 1 relates to a network interface system for interfacing a host system with a network, comprising a transmit output data flow controller configured to control the flow of encryption data from first and second processors to the memory system in the same location as the order in which the data was read from the memory system. In other words, ***data is written to a memory location based upon the order in which data was read from the memory system***. The Office Action states that writing data to a memory location based upon the order in which data was read from the memory system is taught by Minami et al. (See, O.A. of 6/30/09, item 6). However, as will be more fully appreciated below, Minami et al fail to teach ***writing data to a memory location based upon the order in which data was read from the memory system***, as recited in claim 1.

More particularly, Minami et al. teach a security system comprising two parallel and identical encryption engines. (See, par. [1746]). Packets are transferred from a memory to the security system, where the encryption engines are “serviced in

alternating order". (See, par. [1746]). Once serviced, the encrypted packet is written back ***to the same memory location that the source packet came from.*** (See, par. [1745]). Therefore, as taught by Minami, after encryption, packets are written to a memory ***location based upon the location from which they were read.***

In contrast, claim 1 relates to a transmit output data flow controller configured to write data, after encryption, to a memory location ***based upon the order in which the data was read.*** For example, in one non-limiting example, the transmit output data flow controller will write data that is encrypted first to a first memory location, while data that is encrypted second is written to a second memory location.

Accordingly, since the cited art fails to teach a transmit output data flow controller configured to write data to a memory location ***based upon the order in which the data was read,*** Minami et al. in view of Jinzaki fail to teach over the transmit output data flow controller recited in claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 19-21 depend upon claim 1 and add further limitations thereto. Because claim 1 is nonobvious over the cited art, claims 2-5, 7-10 and 19-21 are also believed nonobvious. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIM 7 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0062267 (Minami et al.) and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0014936 (Jinzaki) as applied above, and in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0128553 (Buer). Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

As stated above, independent claim 1 is not taught by the cited prior art. Claim 7 depends upon claim 1, and adds further limitations thereto. Because the primary references do not teach the present invention of claim 1, claim 7 is also non-obvious over the cited art. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIM 10 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0062267 (Minami et al.) and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0014936 (Jinzaki) as applied above, and further in view of Patt, Patel Evers, Friendly, and Start's "One Billion Transistors, One Uniprocessor, One Chip" (Patt). Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

As stated above, independent claim 1 is not taught by the cited prior art. Claim 10 depends upon claim 1, and adds further limitations thereto. Because the primary references do not teach the present invention of claim 1, claim 10 is also non-obvious over the cited art. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIM 21 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0062267 (Minami et al.) and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0014936 (Jinzaki) as applied above, and in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,590,339 (Chang). Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

As stated above, independent claim 1 is not taught by the cited prior art. Claim 21 depends upon claim 1, and adds further limitations thereto. Because the primary references do not teach the present invention of claim 1, claim 21 is also non-obvious over the cited art. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

V. CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, the claims currently under consideration are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should any fees be due as a result of the filing of this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the Deposit Account Number 50-1733, AMDP751US.

Respectfully submitted,
ESCHWEILER & ASSOCIATES, LLC

By /Thomas G. Eschweiler/
Thomas G. Eschweiler
Reg. No. 36,981

National City Bank Building
629 Euclid Avenue, Suite 1000
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 502-0600